

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Customer No. 27061

JUL 06 2006

Patent
Attorney Docket No. GEMS8081.081

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of : Zhang et al.
Serial No. : 09/681,483
Filed : April 13, 2001
For : Method and System to Request Remotely Enabled Access
to Inactive Software Options Resident on a Device
Group Art No. : 2135
Examiner : Dada, B.

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

☐ deposited with the US Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Mailing

☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail ☐ As "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

37 CFR 1.8(a)

37 CFR 1.10

Transmission

☒ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No.: 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Dada at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date:

July 6, 2006

Signature

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. The request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS

JUL 06 2006

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-17 and 19-31 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Additionally, claims 17, 19, 21-23 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Moeller et al (USP 6,694,384) and claims 20 and 24-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moeller in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art.

Applicant appreciates the allowability of claims 1-6, 8-13, 15, 16 and 30.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to unpatentable subject matter. In the Response filed on June 5, 2006, Applicant amended claim 17 to call for a computer data signal process embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions originating from a computer program executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to display a GUI configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device, receive an input of a device identifier, receive a selection of a usage period, receive a selection of an inactive option for enablement from the GUI, cause a remote centralized processing station to generate a code configured to enable the selected inactive option after successful processing of the received inputs and selections, and transmit the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface. Thus, Applicant contends that claim 17 calls for a statutory process that is directed to a practical application of a data signal.

In the Advisory Action of June 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected the amended claim, stating that "claim 17 is directed to a data signal, a data signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of 101." The Examiner's continued rejection ignores the substance of Applicant's amendment made in the prior Response. Claim 17 calls for a computer implemented process. Computer-implemented processes are statutory so long as they are limited to a practical application within the technological arts. *See MPEP § 2106; see also Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 183-184 (1981)*. A claim is limited to a practical application when the process, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the process recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. *MPEP § 2106; see AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., 172 F.3d 1352, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 1999)*. Applicant's independent

claim 17 recites the practical application of a computer data signal process embodied in a carrier wave that causes a processor to perform a series of process steps. The process acts carried out by the processor are a practical application of the computer data signal process, in that they cause the processor to: display a GUI, cause a remote processing station to generate a code, and transmit the code to a device having an inactive option. The process therefore produces a concrete, tangible and useful result, and thus results in a practical application. In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that claim 17, and the claims dependent therefrom, are directed to statutory subject matter. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under §101.

In the rejection of claims 17, 19, 21-23 and 31, the Examiner has repeatedly maintained a rejection that the claimed invention is anticipated by Moeller et al. In sustaining the §102(c) rejection, the Examiner maintains that "Moeller teaches displaying a GUI (i.e., selection from a menu) configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device... [column 4, lines 29-35 and lines 63-67] and transmitting the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface [column 4, lines 41-46 and column 5, lines 1-10]." *Advisory Action, supra at 2*. The Examiner reached this conclusion notwithstanding that Moeller et al. fails to teach or suggest the use of a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device that is different from a second communication interface for transmitting the code to the device.

Moeller et al. clearly discloses that both the request and the key transmission for configuring an office device are made over the same communication interface. Moeller et al. discloses a system whereby a user accesses a list of available features through an interface on the office device to be reconfigured. The user then selects those features that he wishes to enable or download to the office device. Once the desired features are selected, this information is transferred to the office device company. Payment for the selected features is then secured over the Internet or via other secure means. The user then receives an access key or code via the internet to input into the scanner to activate the feature. The process described above is detailed in Moeller et al. at Col. 4, lns. 29-35 and lns. 41-46, and is shown in Fig. 2. The Examiner has improperly identified two separate communication interfaces in the described embodiment. Nowhere in the above description is the feature enablement request made over a first communication interface and access key or code transmission over a second communications

interface that is different from the first communications interface. Instead, both the request and the key transmission are made over the same interface, i.e., the internet.

Moeller et al. further discloses that the user can alternatively telephone the office device company to turn on the desired feature selected from a menu. In response to this telephonic request, the company gives the user an access code which will allow the scanner to configure itself. The access code is given to the customer by the company over the phone and the customer then inputs the access code into the scanner. *See Cols. 4-5, Ins. 63-67 and Ins. 1-10; see also Fig. 3.* Therefore, both the request and the access key are again transmitted in a common communications interface – namely, a telephone call.

Thus, contrary to the conclusions reached by the Examiner, Moeller et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature enablement request made over a first communication interface and the access key or code transmission over a second communications interface that is different from the first communications interface. In the system of Moeller et al., both the request and the key transmission are made over only one of either the internet, telephone, or other secure means. Claim 17 specifically calls for an enablement request to be made over a first communication and for transmission of a code over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface. Therefore, Moeller et al. cannot anticipate that which is called for in claim 17. As such, claim 17 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The Examiner has also repeatedly maintained the rejection to claims 20 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moeller in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art. The combination of Moeller and Applicants Admitted Prior Art, however, fails to teach or suggest that called for in claims 20 and 24-29. Claim 24 calls for, in part, a request to activate an inactive software program made over a public communication connection and an activation of an inactive software program over a private communication connection. As set forth above, in the several embodiments of the system disclosed by Moeller et al., a feature enablement request and the key transmission are made over the same connection – either internet or telephone. Moeller et al. fails to teach or suggest communicating a feature request over a public communication connection and communicating a software key over a private communication connection. Accordingly, that which is set forth in claim 24, and the claims dependent therefrom, is neither

disclosed nor suggested by Moeller et al. and thus, the Examiner's position is not supported by the disclosure of the cited reference.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-17 and 19-31.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Ziolkowski/

Timothy J. Ziolkowski
Registration No. 38,368
Direct Dial 262-376-5139
tjz@zpspatents.com

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin
Registration No. 55,584
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 15
krr@zpspatents.com

Dated: July 6, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.081

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUL 06 2006

PTO/SB/31 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 06551-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM THE EXAMINER TO
THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Docket Number (Optional)

GEMS8081.081

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via
facsimile no. 571-273-8300 to the US Patent and Trademark Office

on July 6, 2006

Signature

Typed or printed

name Kevin R. Rosin

In re Application of
Zhang et al.

Application Number

09/681,483

Filed

April 13, 2001

For Method and System to Request Remotely Enabled
Access to Inactive Software Options Resident on a Device

Art Unit

2135

Examiner

Beemnet W. Dada

Applicant hereby **appeals** to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the last decision of the examiner.

The fee for this Notice of Appeal is (37 CFR 41.20(b)(1))

\$ 500.00

- ☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee shown above is reduced by half, and the resulting fee is:
- ☐ A check in the amount of the fee is enclosed.
- ☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.
- ☐ The Director has already been authorized to charge fees in this application to a Deposit Account. I have enclosed a duplicate copy of this sheet.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. I have enclosed a duplicate copy of this sheet.
- ☐ A petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) (PTO/SB/22) is enclosed.

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

I am the

- ☐ applicant/inventor.
- ☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)
- ☒ attorney or agent of record.
Registration number 38,368
- ☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____



Timothy J. Ziolkowski

Typed or printed name

(262) 376-5170

Telephone number

July 6, 2006

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☐ *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 41.31. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.